DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 795 CE 046 450

AUTHOR Swanson, Richard A.; Sleezer, Catherine M.
TITLE Training Effectiveness Evaluation. Training Development and Research Center Project Number Sixteen.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., St. Paul. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE Jan 87
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Corporate Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Industrial Training; *Job Training; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The gap between evaluation theory and practice can be closed through a concrete system for effectively evaluating a training program to ensure that it contributes to an organization's success. The Training Effectiveness Evaluation (TEE) system can be applied to any training program in industry. It consists of three major elements: (1) an effectiveness evaluation plan, (2) tools for measuring training effectiveness, and (3) the evaluation report. The completed plan specifies the tools that will be used to assess whether the training has produced the desired results. The three categories of evaluation tools--satisfaction, learning, and performance--can be presented as three scores, one for each category. The completed report is a powerful tool for communicating the results of a training program. It provides the management decision maker with the necessary information for understanding the impact of a training program. Content includes the employee/organization performance need, the employee/organization performance goal, the approved solution with both training and nontraining component, narrative summarizing training effectiveness, an evaluation summary with visual presentation and/or comparison to performance goal, and an improvement proposal. (Examples and samples are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279795

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTER

Project Number Sixteen

TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION

Richard A. Swanson
Catherine M. Sleezer
January 1987

university of minnesota
DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION • ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

CE 046450

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Swanson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract*

This article closes the gap between evaluation theory and practice by suggesting a concrete system for effectively evaluating a training program so that training managers can ensure that their programs do contribute to their organization's success. The TEE consists of three major elements: (1) an effectiveness evaluation plan, (2) tools for measuring training effectiveness, and (3) the evaluation report.

* Accepted for publication in the Journal of European Industrial Training.

Training Effectiveness Evaluation

The gap between evaluation theory and practice is a serious problem for training in industry and business (Swanson, 1982). A recent literature review of the summative evaluation on training noted "the general consensus of the authors is that most summative evaluation of training and development programs is not conducted effectively at the present time. It may be concluded that more attention needs to be given to the components of summative evaluation used as a basis for this review and to upgrade the evaluation competencies of training specialists" (Parker, 1986, p.51).

A paradox facing most practicing managers of training is that their nontraining bosses typically neither ask for nor require formal evaluations. And, when these managers do evaluate, it is usually in response to a crisis and invariably it comes too late. A typical workplace scenario consists of the busy training practitioner doing what the company wants, feeling successful, and not being regularly required to prove the added value that results from training. With a full agenda of important training development and delivery tasks, the busy trainer finds it difficult to evaluate training. However, most important organizational functions regularly evaluate their progress and bottom-line contributions to the enterprise. In addition, it has been clearly established that training effectiveness evaluation data, particularly bottom-line performance results, are the key to gaining support for the training function from nontraining managers (Kusy, 1986). It is clearly irrational to not evaluate training effectiveness.

The purpose of this study was to develop and pilot test a practical Training Effectiveness Evaluation (TEE) system that could be applied to any training program in industry. Training personnel from Control Data Corporation and researchers from the University of Minnesota Training and Development Research Center worked together to achieve this purpose.

Both Parker's (1986) review of literature and Kusy's (1986) study of management support of training evaluation established the need for this study. In addition, the TEE is the heart of the control phase of the comprehensive Training Technology System developed by Swanson & Sisson (1985). The other four phases of the Training Technology System are analyze, design, develop, and implement.

The TEE consists of three major elements: (1) an effectiveness evaluation plan, (2) tools for measuring training effectiveness, and (3) the evaluation report.

Evaluation Plan

In TEE, planning decisions are made about which tools will be used to assess whether the training program produced the desired results. The Effectiveness Planning Sheet presents both evaluation tools and effectiveness questions. The four questions represent levels of training effectiveness and should be asked of every training program. They are:

1. Was the training delivered professionally?
2. Were the learning objectives met?
3. Was the original training need met?
4. Was the training valuable?

The evaluation tools, labeled A-F on the effectiveness planning sheet, are used in gathering the information needed to answer the evaluation questions. These tools measure the satisfaction, learning, and performance that result from training and, in the case of Figure 1, focus on basic supervisory training.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

An "x" in a cell on the planning sheet indicates that this evaluation tool is required for all training programs. The open cells represent reasonable evaluation options with choices needing to be made in the learning and performance columns. For the knowledge area, the choice of using a knowledge test (2.C), an in-training performance test (2.D), or both, must be made. For performance, the choices focus on either cost-benefit analysis or performance comparisons. The completed plan requires a minimum of four evaluation tools: Two for satisfaction, one for learning, and one for performance. The tools that are selected also address the four effectiveness questions.

The completed plan specifies the tools that will be used to assess whether the training has produced the desired results. Figure 1 is a plan for a basic supervisory training course. The sample plan shows that the effectiveness of this course will be evaluated using the following measures: trainee satisfaction, trainee supervisor satisfaction, knowledge test, performance comparisons, and cost-benefit analysis.

Tools for Measuring Training Effectiveness

The three categories of evaluation tools--satisfaction, learning, and performance--can be presented as three scores, one for each category. The satisfaction score is an indicator of how pleased trainees and their supervisors were with the training; the learning score is an indicator of the amount of knowledge acquired by the trainees during the training course; and the performance score is an indicator of the effects that result from the training. Although there are many options available to professional trainers for constructing evaluation tools, the TEE focuses on a limited number of reasonable options, not every option.

The TEE requires that trainee satisfaction be measured for every training course. Trainee satisfaction is measured by having each trainee complete the Training Program Evaluation Form (Figure 2). The trainee satisfaction score is calculated by tallying all the trainees' responses to questions 1 through 7. Ordinal values are then assigned to the following descriptors: Very good (4), good (3), fair (2), and poor (1). The overall trainee satisfaction score is obtained by averaging the scores and determining the mean satisfaction score which will fall within the 1-4 range. Sub-scores on the individual questions can also be computed this way.

FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

The comments written by the trainees on the trainee satisfaction form

are not included in the trainee satisfaction score, but instead provide immediate, open-ended feedback for the instructor.

Trainee supervisor satisfaction is measured by using the Management Evaluation Form (Figure 3). This form is completed by each trainee's supervisor. After the responses are gathered, the average supervisor satisfaction score for the training program is computed in the same manner that average trainee satisfaction score and sub-scores are determined. Again, the written comments provide the trainer with immediate, open-ended feedback.

FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The total satisfaction score for the training is computed by averaging the trainee satisfaction score and the trainee supervisor score and dividing this number by 2. This process weights the opinions of both trainees and the supervisors equally. The trainer can report the raw satisfaction score on the 4-point scale or use basic mathematic formulas to express the score as a ratio or percentage.[1]

Using standard trainee and supervisor satisfaction forms for all training courses allows for the comparisons of training courses with each other and across time, making it easy to identify and document recurring problems and/or successes.

Learning in training is measured by knowledge tests, performance tests, or both. Knowledge tests measure the cognitive information learned

by trainees. Two types of knowledge test items--multiple choice and matching--are encouraged because they can be scored objectively and are not as suseptable to guessing. In constructing knowledge tests, care must be taken to ensure that the tests produce valid and reliable results. A test is valid when it measures what it is supposed to measure and it is reliable when it produces consistent results. The job aid for constructing knowledge tests (Figure 4) includes sample test items, validity and reliability criteria, and helpful test construction references.

FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

In-training performance tests measure what the trainees can do by examining either the products that the trainees produce or the processes used by the trainees to exhibit learning. An in-training performance test must also be valid and reliable. The job aid for constructing in-training performance tests (Figure 5) provides examples, criteria for validity and reliability, and helpful performance test references.

FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE

The scores obtained with the knowledge test, the in-training performance test, or both, are used in calculating the total learning score. When learning information is collected using a single tool, that score becomes the total learning score. When both tools are used, the learning score is calculated by computing the percentage correct score for each test and then adding these scores together and dividing by 2. The trainer can either report the raw learning score or express it as a ratio or percentage (see Footnote 1).

In TEE, the tools for measuring the performance that results from training are performance comparisons and cost-benefit analysis. Performance comparisons contrast the productivity of either the organization or the employee after training with the productivity before training or against a goal. Figure 6 is the job aid for performance comparisons.

FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE

Cost-benefit analysis is used to determine the economic value of the training program. The benefit of a training program is determined by subtracting the cost of the training program from the performance value resulting from the program. Figure 7 is the TEE job aid for conducting cost-benefit analysis of training programs.

FIGURE 7 ABOUT HERE

In situations where there is one measure of performance, that measure becomes the performance score. In situations where both measures of performance are used and a composite score is needed, the total scores for both measures can be translated into like terms, or standard scores, added together, and divided by two. Performance scores can be expressed in a variety of ways including ratios, percentages, dollars, and units produced. It is important to express performance measures in terms that have meaning to the organization.

Effectiveness Evaluation Report

TEE also includes systematic reporting of training program evaluations. The report contains the categories of information that training and nontraining managers must know in order to make sound decisions. The content of the report includes the original employee/organization performance need (described in 25 to 75 words), the employee/organization performance goal (summarized in 25 to 50 words), the approved solution with both training and nontraining components (described in 25 to 50 words), narrative summarizing the effectiveness of the training (25 to 50 word descriptions each for the measures of satisfaction, learning, and performance), an evaluation summary with visual presentation and/or comparison to performance goal, and an improvement proposal.

The completed Effectiveness Evaluation Report, as illustrated in the circuit troubleshooting training example (Figure 8), is a powerful tool for communicating the results of a training program. It provides the management decision maker with the necessary information for understanding the impact of a training program.

FIGURE 8 ABOUT HERE

Summary

The TEE provides tools for planning evaluations, gathering the effectiveness information, and reporting the information. Through systematic analysis and reporting of effectiveness evaluations, training managers can ensure that their programs contribute to their organization's bottom line.

References

Kusy, M. E. (1986). The effects of types of training evaluation on support of training among corporate managers (Project No. 12). St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, Training and Development Research Center.

Parker, B. L. (1986). Summative evaluation in training and development. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 23, (2), 29-55.

Roscoe, J. T. (1975). Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Swanson, R. A. (1982). Industrial training. In W. H. Mitzel (Ed.), 5th Encyclopedia of Educational Research (pp. 864-870). New York: MacMillan.

Swanson, R. A., & Sisson, G. R. (1985). Training technology system (abridged ed.). Littleton, CO: Paradigm.

Author Notes

The researchers wish to acknowledge Robert J. Prifrel and Control Data Corporation of Minneapolis, Minnesota, for supporting this research and development project. They also wish to thank Scott W. Johnson and Brian P. Murphy for critically reviewing the manuscript.

Footnotes

[1]It should be noted, however, that a composite score is questionable unless the individual test scores that comprise it come from tests with similar score units, standard deviations and levels of difficulty for test items. The composite score for two dissimilar tests is computed by determining the z-score for each test, combining the scores, and dividing by 2. Additional discussion of z-scores, including the methods for computing them, can be found in Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (Roscoe, 1975).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Basic supervisory training program effectiveness plan.

Figure 2. Instrument for trainee to evaluate training.

Figure 3. Instrument for trainee supervisor to evaluate training.

Figure 4. Knowledge test job aid.

Figure 5. Performance test job aid.

Figure 6. Performance comparison job aid.

Figure 7. Cost-benefit analysis job aid.

Figure 8. A sample effectiveness evaluation report.

Swanson is Professor and Director and Sleezer is Research Assistant, Training and Development Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108.

"Basic Supervisory Training Program Effectiveness Plan"

This planning sheet helps to specify the evaluation tools that will be used to answer the four questions about the training effectiveness of each training program. The questions represent four levels of training effectiveness. The x's in the planning sheet cells indicate the evaluation tools that are required of all training programs. The open cells represent reasonable effectiveness evaluation options with two choices needing to be made. In terms of learning, the choice of using a knowledge test (2.C), a performance test (2.D), or both needs to be made. For performance, the choice is within cells 3.E, 3.F, 4.E, and/or 4.F.

At minimum there should be one evaluation tool each for satisfaction, learning, and performance. Additionally, the selected tools must minimally address the four questions.

PROGRAM TITLE Basic Supervisory Training

PREPARED BY John Mart

APPROVED BY Sara Jameson

DATE 3/27/86

EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONS	EVALUATION TOOLS: SATISFACTION — A. Trainee Satisfaction	SATISFACTION — B. Trainee Supervisor Satisfaction	LEARNING — C. Knowledge Test	LEARNING — D. In-training Performance Test	PERFORMANCE — E. Performance Comparision	PERFORMANCE — F. Cost-benefit Analysis
1. DELIVERY. Was the training delivered professionally?	X					
2. OBJECTIVES. Were the learning objectives met?	X		2.C O	2.D		
3. NEED. Was the original need met?	X	X			3.E O	3.F
4. VALUE. Was the training valuable?	X	X			4.E O	4.F O
	REQUIRED		CHOICE #1		CHOICE #2	

X = required of all training programs

O = choices for this program

TRAINING PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Training Technology System

PROGRAM TITLE _____ DATE _____

INSTRUCTOR(S) _____

_____

"Please answer the following questions to help us improve future training programs."

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Quality of instructor's presentations	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Quality of the information presented	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Amount of time to practice new material	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Quality of feedback on your performance during training	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Quality of training environment	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Usefulness of the course content to your job	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Was attending this training program a good use of your time?	_____	_____	_____	_____

What was the most valuable part of this course for you? _____

_____

_____

What was the least valuable part of this course for you? _____

_____

_____

_____

If you rated any item "poor", please provide some additional explanation. _____

_____

_____

Additional comments would be appreciated. _____

_____

_____

_____

Trainee Name (optional)

MANAGEMENT EVALUATION OF TRAINING

Training Technology System

PROGRAM TITLE: _____

DATES OF TRAINING: _____

TRAINEE(S): _____

TRAINEE SUPERVISOR: _____ DATE: _____

****

"Please answer the following questions to help us improve future training programs."

Now that your employee has completed training and is back on the job, what is your impression of the effectiveness of the training program?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Employees have performed better at their old job or have been able perform a new job following training.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Attending the training was a good use of the employee's time.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Additional comments would be appreciated. _____

KNOWLEDGE TEST

TYPES OF ITEMS:

1. Multiple choice (samples):

To speed up nut turning on tasks where space is limited or where bolts with long threads prevent the use of sockets, use the _____ wrench.

A. crescent
B. combination
C. ratchet
D. allen

Indicate the best answer by circling the number. The most important property of an objective test is:

1. Ease of marking.
2. Accuracy of scoring.
3. Its reliability.
4. Its validity.
5. Complete sampling of the syllabus.

2. Matching (samples):

For each item, write a number to indicate that the statement applies to:

1. Norm-referenced assessment
2. Criterion-referenced assessment
3. Both norm and criterion-referenced assessment
4. Neither norm nor criterion-referenced assessment

_____ Assessment in mastery-based.
_____ Some people must fail; otherwise assessment is too easy.
_____ Assessment is useful for making predictions.

Directions: Column A contains a list of advantages of varied shopping outlets. Choose from Column B the outlet which best fits each advantage in column A and insert the identifying letter in the space provided. Responses in column B may be used more than once.

Column A	Column B
___ 1) "One stop" shopping	a) Mail order
___ 2) Offers 24-hour service	b) Door-to-door
___ 3) Armchair shopping	c) Vending machine
___ 4) All prices may be lower	d) Department store
___ 5) Product demonstrated at home	e) Specialty
___ 6) Open counter display	f) Used clothing

CONTENT VALIDITY:

(...does the test measure what it is supposed to measure?)

1. Make sure that the test matches the content taught and its relative emphasis.
2. Use a matrix with content breakdown on one axis. Use low & high level thinking on the other axis. Weight the distribution of items according to trainee time-on-task or importance.

Content \ Level	Low	High	TOTALS (# and % of test items)
Unit #1	6	6	12 30%
Unit #2	4	2	6 15%
Unit #3	3	5	8 20%
Unit #4	7	7	14 35%
TOTALS (# and % of test items)	20 50%	20 50%	40 100%

RELIABILITY:

(... does the test yield consistent results?)

1. Use at least 25 test items for any one test.
2. Use as many items as possible being careful that the test time does not become unreasonable.

REFERENCES:

Gronlund, N. E. (1982). Constructing achievement tests (3rd edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Parker, B. (1986, Winter). Summative evaluation in training and development. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 23(2), 29-55..

IN-TRAINING PERFORMANCE TEST

TYPES:

1. Process Checksheet (samples):

COURSE: Basic Tools and Hardware

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

TERMINAL PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE:

GIVEN: a torque screwdriver, Phillips head tip, #10-32 x 1/2 Phillips pashead screw, #10 flat washer, #10 hex nut, subassembly workpiece
PERFORMANCE: fastens the hardware to the subassembly workpiece
STANDARD: per the following torque specification of 38 inch/pound

Critical Item	Procedural Steps	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Criteria
	1. Determine torque specification	1	0	specification will be 38 inch/pounds
	2. Locate the adjustment knob	1	0	at the butt end of torque screwdriver handle
	3. Locate torque indicator light	1	0	transparent plastic collar at mid-point of torque screwdriver
	4. Turn adjustment knob	1	0	clockwise/counterclockwise to 38 inch/pounds
	5. Line up torque indicator line	1	0	at the 38 inch/pound setting
	6. Lock the adjustment knob	1	0	adjustment nob locked in place
	7. Insert Phillips head tip into position	1	0	at the end of torque screwdriver opposite adjustment knob
	8. Position screw	1	0	into #10 predrilled hole in subassembly workpiece
	9. Position flat washer	1	0	over shank of prepositioned screw in step 8
	10. Position hex nut	1	0	over shank of prepositioned screw in step 8
	11. Fasten hardware in place	1	0	fingers tighten
	12. Position torque screwdriver	1	0	tip of torque screwdriver securely seated in screw head
	13. Tighten screw	1	0	until clicking sound occurs
	14.	1	0	

MANAGEMENT DELEGATING RESPONSIBILITY

PERF. RATING
GOOD=3
O.K.=2
POOR=1
NO=0

1. Explains the new responsibility to the employee and tells why it is important.
2. Tells the employee the performance standards that are expected for the tasks.
3. Asks the employee if there are any questions or suggestions and responds to the concerns that are expressed.
4. Asks the employee to make a commitment to the responsibility.
5. Tells the employee that you have confidence in their ability to carry out the responsibility.

Total _____

2. Product Specifications (samples):

– Amperage Scale –

Product rating scale for assessing the appropriateness of the amperage setting for welds made by students. Ten points are awarded to welds made at the appropriate amperage (heat) setting and proportionately fewer points are awarded to welds that are judged as being either too "hot" or too "cold".

Directions: Rate the instrument according to the following criteria by placing a "X" in the appropriate blank.

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	YES	NO
Quality	Does it measure quality of the performance? Skill . . . . . Attitude	____	____
Efficiency	Does it measure efficiency of the operation?	____	____
Ease of use	Does the language, design, length, and degree of detail promote ease of use?	____	____
Achievement of Goals	Does it achieve the goals of monitoring student programs, diagnosing, certifying, and evaluating instructions? . .	____	____
Adaptability	Does it serve, with little revision, for self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and instructor supervisor evaluation? . .	____	____
Validity	Does it measure what it was designed to measure?	____	____
Reliability	Does it provide trustworthy or consistent measure? . . .	____	____

Recommendations for Change

CONTENT VALIDITY:

(...does the test measure what it is supposed to measure?)

1. Make sure that the process checksheet contains all the critical steps specified by the work behavior analysis.
2. Make sure that all the product specifications, quality and quantity, are included in the evaluation criteria.

RELIABILITY:

(...does the test yield consistent results?)

1. Have trainees exhibit the process at least twice and produce at least two products.
2. If #1 is not possible, have trainee talk through the process while doing it or describe the specifications to insure correct rating.

REFERENCES:

Richards, B. (1985, Summer). Performance objectives as the basis for criterion-referenced performance Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 22 (4), 28-37.

Wentling, T. L., and Lawson, T. E. (1975). Evaluating occupational education and training programs. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERFORMANCE COMPARISION

TYPES:

1. Employee Job Performance (samples):
   ... (same information as presented on the Performance Test)

2. Organization Performance (samples):

The training staff decided to evaluate the effectiveness of [illegible] discovery training program by considering whether training made an impact on 1985 sales. To conduct this evaluation, they utilized a design which examined sales volume per month across each sales district before and after training phases was contingent on the Sales District of which the sales representative was a member. The staggered line represents the actual training program which occurred over a two day period. The following figure illustrates this method.

Figure. Sales per month before and after training


Before Training
After Training
Midwest Sales District A
Midwest Sales District B
Midwest Sales District C
1985 Sales (in millions)
J F M A M J J A S O N D
Time (in months) for 1985

COMPARATIVE MANUFACTURING PRODUCTIVITY

Superior A		Superior B		Superior C	
Employee no.	Hrly. prod.	Employee no.	Hrly. prod.	Employee no.	Hrly. prod.
1	163	11	194	21	172
2	149	12	138	22	137
3	118	13	137	23	136
4	108	14	131	24	135
5	106	15	110	25	127
6	93	16	83	26	100
7	60	17	61	27	56
8	57	18	49	28	52
9	42	19	48	29	41
10	30	20	41	30	28
Average	92.6	Average	99.8	Average	98.4

CONTENT VALIDITY:
(...does the test measure what it is supposed to measure?)

1. Determine if the organization regularly collects data on the performance of the work group in the area under investigation.
2. Make sure that unit of performance selected is the same or a good approximation of the performance need specified in the original needs assessment.

RELIABILITY:
(...does the test yield consistent results?)

1. If using organizational records, inquire about the reliability of the data collection methods.
2. Use controls such as comparision of group performance during earlier time periods before and after the program.

REFERENCES:

Gilbert, T. F. (1978). Human Competence. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kusy, M. E. (1986). The effects of types of training evaluation on support of training among coorporate managers. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

TYPES

1. Cost Analysis

COST ANALYSIS WORK SHEET

Forecaster _____ Date _____

1. Needs Analysis/planning
   - Staff _____
   - External consultant costs _____
   - Materials _____
   - _____ _____
   - _____ _____
   - Subtotal $_____
2. Work behavior analysis
   - Staff _____
   - External consultant costs _____
   - Materials _____
   - Subtotal $_____
3. Design
   - Staff _____
   - External consultant costs _____
   - Materials _____
   - External support costs _____
   - Subtotal $_____
4. Development
   - Staff _____
   - External consultant costs _____
   - Materials _____
   - _____ _____
   - Subtotal $_____
5. Implementation
   - Trainee _____
   - Facilities _____
   - Tuition/fees _____
   - Staff _____
   - Materials _____
   - _____ _____
   - Subtotal $_____
6. Evaluation
   - Staff _____
   - External consultant costs _____
   - _____ _____
   - _____ _____
   - Subtotal $_____
7. Total costs (sum of all subtotals) Total $_____

2. Performance Valuing

NET PERFORMANCE VALUE CALCULATION WORK SHEET

A. Data Required for Calculations
   - (a) What is the desired performance as a result of worker training?
   - (b) What unit(s) of measure will be used to describe the performance? _____
   - (c) What is the dollar value that will be assigned to each unit of measure? _____
   - (d) What is the estimated training time to reach the goal? _____
   - (e) What is the current level of worker performance? _____
   - (f) How many workers will participate in the training? _____

B. Calculations to Determine Net Performance Value
   - (g) What is the estimated performance level during training? Will trainee produce during training?
     _____ No = 0 _____ Yes = $\frac{d+e}{2}$
   - (h) What is the length of the period being evaluated (at a minimum this will be the longest "d" of all options under consideration)? _____
   - (i) What is the estimate of the total number of units (h) that will be achieved during training? [d x g] _____
   - (j) What is the estimate of the total individual performance for the evaluation period? [(h - d) x a] + i _____
   - (k) What is the value for the total performance for the evaluation period? [c x j] _____
   - (l) What is the net performance value gain? [k - (e x c x h)] _____
   - (m) Do you want to calculate the total net performance value of all trainees? _____
     _____ Yes = l x f
     _____ No = Net Performance Value of one trainee which is value of "l"

3. Cost-Benefit Model

$$\frac{\text{Performance Value} - \text{Cost}}{\text{Benefit}}$$

CONTENT VALIDITY:
(...does the test measure what it is supposed to measure?)

1. Make sure the cost categories are the same as those regularly used in the organization. Have someone in accounting and T&D department verify categories.
2. Make sure the unit of performance and its worth is reasonable and acceptable to the decision makers in the organization.

RELIABILITY:
(...does the test yield consistent results?)

1. Double check the individual numbers and their manipulation in the formula.
2. Have a second analyst prepare a cost-benefit analysis.

REFERENCES:

Geroy, G. D., & Swanson, R. A. (1984, Fall). Forecasting training costs and benefits. Journal of Epsilon Pi Tau, 10(2), 15-19.

Head, G. E., & Buchanan, C. C. (1981). Cost/benefit analysis of training: A foundation for change. NSPI Journal, 20(9), 25-27.

Kearsley, G., & Compton, T. (1981). Assessing costs, benefits and productivity in training systems. Training and Development Journal, 35(1), 52-61.

EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT

Program Title: Circuit Troubleshooting
Program Date(s): 2/20/86
Department: Technical Training Department
Prepared By: Mark Baber
Distributed To: James Birt, Mark Olser, Rob Drew

1. ORIGINAL EMPLOYEE/ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE NEED

The timeliness of repairs in the circuit areas was not sufficient to meet the schedule demands: average thru-put time was 115 hours. The first-fix repair rate was 68% and the additional repair process resulted in equipment being unnecessarily damaged.

2. EMPLOYEE/ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE GOAL

Training goals were a first-fix rate of 80% and an average thru-put time of 59 hours. Availability of CE-4 insertion tools was expected to improve the thru-put time by 4 hours and the revised part ordering system was expected to improve thru-put time by 2 hours.

3. APPROVED SOLUTION (TRAINING AND NON-TRAINING COMPONENTS)

Peters approved circuit troubleshooting training for the 61 test technicians and indicated that CE-4 insertion tools would be available for all trainees. She also approved the implementation of the revised system for part ordering. (Memo 1/86)

4. EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING

The effectiveness of the Circuit Troubleshooting Training was measured from the perspectives of satisfaction, learning, and performance.

Satisfaction measurements were obtained from the trainees and from their supervisors. The trainees mean rating for delivery effectiveness was 62%, the quality of information presented rating was 50%, and the usefulness of this training to their jobs rating was 90%. The overall management rating of this course was 70.5%.

Learning during training was measured by a knowledge test and by performance in-training. The comparison of the pre and post test of knowledge showed an increase of 57.6% for the group. The in-training performance was measured with lab tests. The average trainee score was 96%.

Performance measurements showed a 15% improvement for first-fix efficiency and a 57 hour improvement on thru-put time. Cost-benefit analysis showed a training benefit of $715,365.

5. EVALUATION SUMMARY





The data represented in the graphs was obtained from the SQC records of the test department. The time period for the "before training" data is 30 days and the time period for the "after training" data is 45 days.

6. IMPROVEMENT PROPOSAL

1. Trainees indicated that they want more feedback on their performance during training. Instructors will respond to this suggestion.
2. CE-4 insertion tools are still needed for approximately 10 test technicians.